

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1705**

---

ERIC S. CLARK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE COUNTY OF FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA; RICHARD W. NAGEL, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; R. L. DAVIS, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; JOHN SPATA, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; JOHN H. KIM, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; T. B. SMITH, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; S. N. BRIM, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; JONATHAN STERN, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; KENNETH PFEIFFER, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; RANDALL C. HARGUS, Individually and in capacity as employee of Fairfax County, Virginia; JOHN DOE #1; JOHN DOE #2; JOHN DOE #3; JOHN DOE #4; JOHN DOE #5; JOHN DOE #6; JOHN DOE #7; JOHN DOE #8; JOHN DOE #9; JOHN DOE #10; JOHN DOE #11; JOHN DOE #12; JOHN DOE #13; JOHN DOE #14; JOHN DOE #15; JOHN DOE #16; JOHN DOE #17; JOHN DOE #18; JOHN DOE #19; JOHN DOE #20; JOHN DOE #21; JOHN DOE #22; JOHN DOE #23; JOHN DOE #24; JOHN DOE #25; JOHN DOE #26; JOHN DOE #27; JOHN DOE #28; JOHN DOE #29; JOHN DOE #30,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (1:13-cv-00616-GBL-JFA)

---

Submitted: November 4, 2015

Decided: December 3, 2015

---

Before KEENAN, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Eric S. Clark, Appellant Pro Se. Jamie Marie Greenzweig, FAIRFAX COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Fairfax, Virginia; John David Gilbody, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eric S. Clark appeals the district court's order denying his motion for leave to amend the complaint, following the district court's dismissal of Clark's first complaint under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) and this Court's affirmance of that order. See Clark v. Cnty. of Fairfax, 554 F. App'x 171 (4th Cir. 2014) (No. 13-2101). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED